

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

KAREN HEPP,

Plaintiff

v.

FACEBOOK, INC., ET AL.,

Defendants

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 19-4034-JMY

ORDER

AND NOW, this 3rd day of August, 2020, upon consideration of Defendant WGCZ, S.R.O.'s ("WGCZ") Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 77), Plaintiff's Opposition to WGCZ's Motion and Cross-Motion to Amend the Complaint to Add a Count for Successor Liability and to Add a Party (ECF No. 83), and all documents submitted in support thereof and in opposition thereto, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. Defendant WGCZ's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 77) is **GRANTED** and WGCZ is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** from this action.
2. Plaintiff's Cross-Motion to Amend the Complaint to Add a Count for Successor Liability and to Add a Party (ECF No. 83) is **DENIED**.
3. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.¹

¹ Having dismissed Plaintiff's claims against all named Defendants, Plaintiff's remaining claims exist solely against Doe Defendants. *See McGinty v. Brennan*, No. 15-6855, 2017 WL 1536417, at *3 n.6 (D.N.J. Apr. 27, 2017) (citing *Baker v. United States*, 642 Fed. App'x 147, 152 (3d Cir. 2016) ("Case law is clear that an action cannot be maintained solely against Doe defendants."); *Breslin v. Philadelphia*, 92 F.R.D. 764, 765 (E.D. Pa. 1981) ("Given the identification of the remaining defendants only as 'John Doe,' there is no method of serving the complaint in accord with due process, and no way that the action can otherwise proceed.")). Accordingly, Plaintiff's Amended Complaint is dismissed in its entirety. *Id.*

4. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED TO CLOSE THIS CASE.**
IT IS SO ORDERED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ John Milton Younge
Judge John Milton Younge